Nonetheless, the bank has recently taken a policy decision not to pay officiating allowance to any officer in any scale except where customer service is likely to be adversely affected. Officiating arrangements as stated above, are made to meet an emergent/unforeseen/expedient situation. Further removing/minimising such mismatches is a constant endeavour and an ongoing process with the Bank.

Pay Revision of SBI Officers

7792. SHRI JIBON ROY: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that pay revision proposals for the officers of the State Bank of India had been sent to the Finance Ministry by the Indian Banks Association for heir approval; and

(b) if so, on which date it had been sent to the Finance Ministry by the IBA and by when this proposal is likely to be cleared by the Ministry?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY): (a) and (b) No, Sir. However, proposals for pay revision of officers in the public sector banks are under discussion between the Indian Banks' Association and the Officers' Associations. After IBA concludes the discussions their recommendations will be sent to the Ministry for approval.

Excise duty on machinaery and laboratory equipment

7793. SHRI SUSHILKUMAR SAMBHAJIRAO SHINDE: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether excess excise duty collected on machinery plant and laboratory equipment which treats materials by condensing or cooling other than refrigeration and airconditioning machinery under the head 84.19 in the Memorandum appended to Finance Bill 1993, which was stated to have been inadvertently raised from 15 per cent to 110 per cent instead of reducing it to 10 per cent as prescribed under the said memorandum, has since been refunded;

(b) whether the said enhanced duty which on representation was reduced and restored to 15 per cent with effect from April 23, 1993 has since made effective retrospectively from April 1, 1993; if not, the reasons therefor;

(c) whether responsibility for unintentional increase in duty on these items from 15 per cent to 110 per cent has since been fixed; if so, on whom the same has been fixed. and

(d) the reasons for not reducing the duty to 10 per cent as provided in the said Memorandum, instead of 15 per cent?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY): (a) The excess excise duty paid on machinery plant or laboratory equipment which treats material by condensing or cooling other than refrigeration and airconditioning machinery falling under Chapter heading 84.19 of Central Excise Tariff Act, 1985, has not been refunded as the provisions of Section 11-C(2) read with Section 11-B of Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944 have not been complied with by the assessees.

(b) The duty liabilty on these goods in excess of 15 per cent, for the period 28.02.1993 to 22.04.1993, has since been exempted by Notification No. 35/94-CE(NT) dated 04.08.1994 issued under Section 11-C of Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944.

(c) The manner of description of goods against Sr. No. 8 in Notification No. 51/93 did not intend to change the earlier concessional duty of 15 per cent on these items. The error was entirely due to inadvertance.

(d) The Memorandum explaining the provisions in the Finance Bill, 1993 refers to reduction in excess duty on specified capital goods falling within Chap-